

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
In re: :
PULP FINISH 1 COMPANY (f/k/a Journal : Chapter 11
Register Company), *et al.*, : Case No. 12-13774 (SMB)
Debtors. : Jointly Administered
-----X

**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER
DENYING MOTION TO AMEND
FINDINGS AND FOR RECONSIDERATION
AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

A P P E A R A N C E S:

MR. JAMES D. SCHNELLER
Movant *Pro Se*
430 East Lancaster Avenue E 25
Saint Davids, PA 19087

On January 16, 2014, the Court issued a 26 page *Memorandum Decision and Order Denying Various Forms of Relief Requested by James D. Schneller* (the “Decision”). The *Decision* chronicled Scheller’s litigiousness and dealt at length with a myriad of motions, including a motion to reconsider prior rejections of the same arguments. Schneller did not identify any fact or legal principle that the Court overlooked, and instead, repeated the same issues he has repeatedly raised unsuccessfully before the Court. He also sought to intervene and a stay pending appeal. The Court denied all of the requested relief.

Schneller has now filed yet another motion that asks me to amend certain of the findings in the *Decision* or reconsider my refusal to reconsider. (See ECF Doc. # 966.) He also takes issue with the denial of his motion to stay the bankruptcy proceedings. His pleading goes through the *Decision* and contests the choice of certain words and phrases, again arguing they are wrong. He again disagrees with the rejection of arguments he previously made and lost. As

Schneller has failed to identify any material fact or principle of law that was overlooked, or suggest any other reason that would normally justify the amendment of findings or reconsideration, the motion is denied.

Furthermore, Schneller's refusal to accept the finality of any decision issued by this Court has resulted in numerous motions, motions to reconsider, and now motions to reconsider orders denying motions to reconsider. Reading and addressing his arguments, which have become frivolous through sheer repetition despite rejection, have placed an intolerable burden on the Court, the attorneys for the creditors and on the creditors themselves who must ultimately answer for counsel's fees through reduced distributions.

Accordingly, Schneller is directed to show cause at a hearing to be held at 10:00 a.m. on February 19, 2014 in Room 723 of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York why an order should not be entered pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) and the Court's inherent authority enjoining Schneller from filing any further papers in this Court in this bankruptcy case except upon further order of this Court. *See Satterfield v. Pfizer, Inc.*, 2005 WL 1765708, at *14 (S.D.N.Y. July 18, 2005) (collecting cases), *aff'd*, 208 F. Appx. 59 (2d Cir. 2006).

So ordered.

Dated: New York, New York
February 3, 2014

/s/ Stuart M. Bernstein
STUART M. BERNSTEIN
United States Bankruptcy Judge